

in his language indicates that even at that point in time social science was able to distinguish between response to rhetoric and response to reality. After distinguishing between an urban crisis that the American people really do not accept, and a crisis of race that American people fully realize but do not quite know how to relate to, Moynihan concluded:

I think we would underestimate the fundamentally healthy instinct of those . . . who talk [about] black power if we do not see that they are recognizing the reality of segregation and saying we have got to find in ourselves resources of strength and stability [to] live through what is in effect going to be a generation of siege for Negro Americans. I think it is profoundly in the public interest that we should recognize the reality of the problems which these men recognize, which the Black Muslims recognize. I think we have to do two things: We have to guarantee employment to men, and if it comes at the cost of some women's jobs, worse things can happen. We have to maintain the educational training programs related to employment that we have already begun very well, and we have to provide an income supplement for families that will maintain and provide a family income for the working class, the lower classes of this country.

It has been a long political trek since these statements by Mondale and Moynihan, one that involved the assassination of a front-running candidate, followed by the election of what President Carter refers to as "a disgraced president" and concluded by the appointment of the two highest executive officials in the land. It remains too early to determine if the demands for ethical conduct by public officials will result in a more humane type of rule or a new variety of dogmatism, in which moralism displaces positivism as the operational codebook of those who govern.

The role of social science obviously remains a very small part of the electoral efforts which have returned the Democratic party to the Executive Office. But it does remain a large part of the efforts to forge rational alternatives to ideological bluster and populist puffery alike. □

---

#### READINGS SUGGESTED BY THE AUTHOR:

- Allison, Graham, and Szanton, Peter. *Remaking Foreign Policy: The Organizational Connection*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis. *Ideology and Utopia in the United States, 1956-1976*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Meltsner, Arnold J. *Policy Analysts in the Bureaucracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- Reagan, Michael D. *Science and the Federal Patron*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

---

*Irving Louis Horowitz is professor of sociology and political science at Rutgers University, editor of Studies in Comparative International Development, and editor-in-chief of Society magazine. He is the author of many works, most recently Ideology and Utopia in the United States, 1956-1976.*

## Mobilizing Social Science

— Richard Falk —

With a new administration in office it is appropriate to reconsider the reciprocal contributions of the government and the social sciences. In recent decades the Democratic party has been more idealistic than its Republican opponents, and idealism in America has always been associated with the encouragement of higher education, with making things better by knowing more. Because Jimmy Carter has definitely associated himself with this idealistic tradition, it seems reasonable to expect increased receptivity in the next few years to proposals designed to strengthen the social sciences and their role in shaping the future of human society.

#### Transition and Challenge

I am not particularly interested in proposals that seek to strengthen the social sciences per se, nor am I eager to make it more likely that social scientists will again advise the prince on matters of foreign policy. However, I do see a serious need to encourage training and research activities relating to long-term normative change in social, economic, political, and cultural systems, especially of transnational and global scales.

In advocating such a priority I am making an historical judgment that we are in the midst of a transition process as fundamental as the convulsive process that accompanied the transition from feudal Europe to the modern state system. Adjusting humanely and rapidly to this transition course is the critical challenge of our era, and yet we know very little about what is happening and about what the contour of the future is likely to be. The scenarios, projected trends, and large reports devised by "think tanks" and "futurologists" have not been successful in making our citizenry or its leadership sensitive to the long-term issues that center upon the shaping of a new system of world order premised upon the values of peace, economic well-being, social and political justice, and ecological balance.

The official institutions of government are preoccupied by short-term challenges. To deal successfully with this agenda of immediate issues it is virtually necessary to take for granted the existing political framework both nationally and internationally; yet it is the framework of our political life that is being increasingly endangered by the interplay of the war system, massive poverty, widespread repression, population pressure, resource depletion, pollution, and terrorism. These threats pose a crisis of structural proportions for ourselves and the world.

---

### In an emergency situation it is necessary to mobilize talents and skills to promote the common good

---

Throughout the world moderate politics are losing out to extremist politics, reinforced by militarism and flagrant disregard of fundamental human rights. The pattern is exemplified by recent developments in countries as diverse as Chile, Thailand, Nigeria, South Korea, and the Philippines. The trend toward political absolutism in the Third World is matched by an equally disturbing trend toward economic and political instability in Western Europe and Japan.

Both trends reflect a wider crisis of structural proportions: the emerging inability of the sovereign state to satisfy the needs of the population living within its boundaries. The difficulties are multiple and vary in complexion with the circumstances of a particular country, but the common reality of internal and external pressures is present almost everywhere. Besides the apocalyptic dangers associated with nuclear war and ecological collapse are the less dramatic, but nevertheless profound, Orwellian threats associated with faceless authoritarian rule supervised by a mixture of generals and technocrats. Energy costs, population growth, pollution, corruption, poverty, nuclear proliferation, urban crime, and political terrorism suggest some dimensions of this deteriorating situation. The cumulative effect suggests the reality of a civilizational emergency every bit as serious as the sort of national emergency that exists during a period of warfare.

#### **Adaptation and Survival**

In a situation of emergency it is necessary to mobilize talents and skills to promote the common good. We need to encourage official institutions in Washington and elsewhere to mobilize the talents of social scientists and humanists to create for our people and for the peoples of the world a diagnosis of this deteriorating planetary situation, some prognostic indication of the range of plausible outcomes, and some ideas, however tentative, about possible lines of therapy. The mission of such a mobilization is not indoctrination, but the opposite—the raising of fundamental questions about what “security” and “well-being” mean in a crowded planet inhabited by deeply aggrieved groups who will have increasing access to instruments of mass destruction. Social scientists and humanists must focus upon the kinds of values

needed by our society (and, more broadly, by our species) to assure survival and build confidence that we can deal with fundamental human needs.

On this basis several specific proposals can be advanced for consideration:

- Support for research and training programs across the country devoted to the issues raised here;
- Establishment of an endowed national institute, comparable to the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, devoted exclusively to the prospects for a just and peaceful world and staffed by scholars from all over the world;
- Encouragement through the United Nations, possibly UNESCO in conjunction with the United Nations University, of the establishment of comparable transnational institutes throughout the world, with rotating faculties and staffs;
- Establishment within the Department of State of a separate bureaucratic unit (comparable to the Policy Planning Staff) devoted to intermediate-range and long-range issues and staffed by noncareer, rotating social scientists who have suitable credentials to carry on such work and to stimulate nonincremental policy proposals, especially ones bearing on energy use and arms policy;
- Establishment of an annual prize or citation under presidential auspices for social scientists who make the greatest contribution to solving long-range problems of peace and justice in human affairs.

Social scientists need to be encouraged to do work on normative issues that bear upon the prospects for desirable forms of adaptation to this great process of historical transition. Of course the Club of Rome (Limits to Growth), the Institute for World Order (World Order Models Project), and the Council on Foreign Relations (the 1980s Project) have been carrying on work along these lines in recent years. But a much wider program of studies is needed to build a societal climate that will allow leaders to base policy upon values that could make the transition process a time of hope rather than despair. □

---

#### *READINGS SUGGESTED BY THE AUTHOR:*

- Beres, Louis, and Targ, Harry, eds. *Planning Alternative World Futures*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.
- Dedring, Jaergen. *Recent Advances in Peace and Conflict Research*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Falk, Richard. *A Study of Future Worlds*. New York: Free Press, 1975.
- Mendlovitz, Saul, ed. *On the Creation of a Just World Order*. New York: Free Press, 1975.
- Myrdal, Alva. *The Game of Disarmament: How the United States and Russia Run the Arms Race*. New York: Random House, Pantheon Books, 1977.

---

*Richard Falk is Albert G. Milbank Professor of International Law and Practice and professor in the Center of International Studies at Princeton University. Formerly he taught at Ohio State University. He is the author of many books and articles and is senior fellow at the Institute for World Order.*